BRILL

MEDIEVAL ENCOUNTERS 21 (2015) 190–213

Medieval Encounters
Jewish, Christian and Muslim Culture in Confluence and Dialogue

brill.com/me

Pope, Council, and the *Filioque* in Western Theology, 1274–1439

Chris Schabel
Department of History and Archaeology, University of Cyprus,
P.O. Box 20537, Nicosia, Cyprus 1678
schabel@ucy.ac.cy

Abstract

The doctrine of the *Filioque* was officially determined at the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215, at the Second Council of Lyon in 1274 the determination was clarified, and this clarification was repeated in 1439 in the formulation of the Council of Florence. Yet the *Filioque* was already universally accepted in the Latin West by 1100, while the clarification at Lyon was the general teaching before 1274. Rather than establish doctrine, then, Innocent III at Lateran IV and Gregory X at Lyon II merely codified it, offering codifications that were later incorporated into canon law under Gregory IX and Boniface VIII, respectively. A survey of several dozen university treatments of the procession of the Holy Spirit between 1274 and 1439 reveals that the conciliar pronouncements under the popes played little role in the discussion, and where they appear, it is usually as a brief statement of what was official. By the late fourteenth century, some theologians doubted that the *Filioque* as expressed in 1215 and 1274 could be defended rationally, an indication that convincing the Greeks at Florence to accept true dogmatic union would be impossible.

Keywords

Forth Lateran Council – Filioque doctrine – Conciliar pronouncements – Second Council of Lyon – Council of Florence

© KONINKLIJKE BRILL NV, LEIDEN, 2015 | DOI 10.1163/15700674-12342191

Introduction

From one point of view, the papacy was most successful in implementing new strategies to bring Eastern Christian communities into Latin obedience in areas under the secular control of rulers subject to Rome ecclesiastically. In 1274 this meant primarily the dwindling Greek communities in Sicily and Southern Italy, the shrinking Latin territories in Syria-Palestine and mainland Greece, the more stable big islands of Cyprus and Crete, and perhaps Cilician Armenia.[1] To the extent that they were successful, the strategies in these areas were hardly intellectual: in exchange for an oath of obedience, the papacy was almost always prepared to tolerate differences in rite and to ignore long-standing differences in doctrine. Leaving aside the strange provincial council of Nicosia in 1340,[2] in which the higher Greek, Maronite, Armenian, Nestorian, and Jacobite clergies apparently accepted the Roman teaching on the procession of the Holy Spirit, purgatory, the validity of the use of unleavened eucharistic bread, and papal primacy, we find that it was the Greeks who complained about Latin beliefs and rites, so loudly that a dozen of them were burned at the stake in Nicosia, Cyprus, in 1231 as punishment for refusing to stop calling the Latins heretics for employing the wrong kind of bread.[3] Not that the papacy accepted the doctrine of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the

1 For these areas, see for example Peter Herde, "The Papacy and the Greek Church in Southern Italy between the Eleventh and the Thirteenth Century," in *The Society of Normal Italy*, ed. G. A. Loud and A. Metcalfe (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 213–252; Bernard Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States: The Secular Church* (London: Variorum 1980); Jean Richard, "The Establishment of the Latin Church in the Empire of Constantinople, 1204–1277," in *Latins and Greeks in the Eastern Mediterranean*, ed. B. Arbel, B. Hamilton, and D. Jacoby (Ilford: Frank Cass, 1989), 45–62; Michael S. Kordoses, *Southern Greece under the Franks (1204–1262): A Study of the Greek Population and the Orthodox Church under Frankish Domination* (Ioannina: University of Ioannina School of Letters, 1987); Chris Schabel, "The Status of the Greek Clergy in Early Frankish Cyprus," in *"Sweet Land . . .": Lectures on the History and Culture of Cyprus*, ed. J. Chrysostomides and Ch. Dendrinos (Camberley, Surrey: Porphyrogenitus, 2006), 165–207, reprinted in Chris Schabel, *Greeks, Latins, and the Church in Early Frankish Cyprus* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2010), study no. I; Nikolaos B. Tomadakis, "Οι ορθοδόξοι παπάδες επί ενετοκρατίας και η χειροτονία αυτών," *Κρητικά Χρονικά* 13 (1959): 39–72.

2 *The Synodicum Nicosiense and Other Documents of the Latin Church of Cyprus, 1196–1373*, ed. and trans. Ch. Schabel (Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre, 2001), no. L.1–14, 248–259.

3 See Chris Schabel, "Martyrs and Heretics, Intolerance of Intolerance: the Execution of Thirteen Monks in Cyprus in 1231," in Schabel, *Greeks, Latins, and the Church*, study no. III, 1–33, and the sources and literature cited there.

Father alone; the popes just didn't bring up the *Filioque* when dealing with Greeks under Latin rule.[4]

The papacy treated areas outside Latin political control differently. This was clear in the 1240s, when the Franciscan Lawrence of Portugal was sent as papal legate to Armenia, Iconium, Turkey, Greece, and the Kingdom of Babylon, with legatine control over the Greeks, Jacobites, Maronites, and Nestorians in the patriarchates of Antioch and Jerusalem and in the Kingdom of Cyprus. When Lawrence offered special jurisdictional terms in exchange for obedience to Rome, the Greeks already under Latin rule jumped at the chance, only to be told, "Oh no, we didn't mean *you*!"[5]

But if nominal obedience under special jurisdictional terms was requested of non-Latin groups outside of Latin secular dominion, when dealing with Greeks, at least, for example in Constantinople after 1261, doctrine was always on the negotiating table as well. It was as if the pope wanted a certain number of points, and if he could not get enough in terms of obedience, he would make it up in doctrine. Thus the same pope who sent Lawrence of Portugal to the East, Innocent IV, also wrote to the Franciscan Minister General, John of Parma, telling him that Greeks returning to obedience had to abjure their error about the Holy Spirit.[6] Alexander IV referred to the issue vaguely once in a letter to his legate,[7] and the only other papal reference to the subject between 1204 and 1274 seems to be in Clement IV's letter to Emperor Michael VIII Palaiologos in 1267,[8] presenting a profession of faith including the *Filioque*, which the Greek representatives at Lyon accepted in 1274.

Because they dealt with doctrine, the union councils of 1274 and 1439 were great intellectual events in one way or another: the Second Council of Lyon was distinguished by the participants, since Bonaventure was there and Thomas Aquinas died on his way, although we are uncertain whether there was any discussion; there was much debate in 1439, but hardly any great Western theologian was alive then, and the most prominent ones did not attend the

4 See, for example, the chapter "Relations with the Orthodox, 1098–1187" of Hamilton, *The Latin Church in the Crusader States*, 159–187, who makes it abundantly clear that "unity was more important than uniformity" (165) for the Latin Church.

5 Latest editions in Chris Schabel, *Bullarium Cyprium*, vol. 1: *Papal Letters Involving Cyprus 1196–1261* (Nicosia: Cyprus Research Centre, 2010), nos. e-16, 22, 28, and 42.

6 *Acta Innocentii papae IV* (*1243–1254*), ed. Th. Haluscynskyj and M. M. Wojnar (Rome: Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1962), no. 71.

7 *Acta Alexandri IV* (*1255–1261*), ed. Th. Haluscynskyj and M. M. Wojnar (Rome: Pontificia Università Gregoriana, 1966), no. 28.

8 *Acta Urbani IV, Clementis IV, Gregorii X* (*1261–1276*), ed. A. L. Tăutu (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1963), no. 24.

Council of Florence—Nicholas of Cusa, who helped arrange the council, was in Germany during the proceedings.[9] This paper is about the different roles of pope, council, and theologian in formulating and developing doctrine on the main topic of dogmatic disagreement between Greeks and Latins, the *Filioque*. Did the pope, as leader of the general council, play a leading role, or did he follow the theologians? Here I will examine the perspective of the theologians on the issue.

By 1274, Western theologians had at their disposal a number of powerful philosophical arguments to convince their opponents that the Holy Spirit proceeds not only from the Father, as the Greeks claimed, but also from the Son.[10] In the course of the fourteenth century, however, some bachelors of theology admitted that ultimately the *Filioque* has to be taken on faith, faith, of course, determined by the Church. In the 1370s, the famous Pierre d'Ailly, later chancellor of the University of Paris, stated exactly that:

> There is a disagreement between the Latins and the Greeks, but this [doctrine of the *Filioque*] is more to be taken on faith than proven by reason. Some try to prove this conclusion with arguments, but I say without qualification that this cannot be concluded by reason. Rather all arguments that are made for this can be dissolved easily. Thus it is solely to be held on the authority of the faith, namely from the determination of the Church of God, nor do I prove it in any other way.[11]

---

9 See, e.g., Joseph Gill, *The Council of Florence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959); James McEvoy, "Robert Grosseteste and the Reunion of the Church," *Collectanea Franciscana* 45 (1975): 39–84, reprinted in McEvoy, *Robert Grosseteste. Exegete and Philosopher* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1994), no. II; Burkhard Roberg, *Das Zweite Konzil von Lyon* (Paderborn: F. Schöningh, 1990).

10 The standard survey is now Russell L. Friedman, *Intellectual Traditions at the Medieval University. The Use of Philosophical Psychology in Trinitarian Theology among the Franciscans and Dominicans, 1250–1350*, 2 vols. (Leiden: Brill, 2013), but there is also Friedman's briefer *Medieval Trinitarian Thought from Aquinas to Ockham* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010).

11 Petrus de Alliaco, *Quaestiones super libros Sententiarum cum quibusdam in fine adiunctis*, I, q. 8, a. 1 (Strasbourg: Georg Husner, 1490; reprint Frankfurt: Minerva, 1968), fol. 93ra: "Prima conclusio est quod Spiritus Sanctus procedit a Patre et Filio aeternaliter . . . Prima igitur inter Latinos et Graecos est in discordia, tamen illa magis est ex fide supponenda quam ratione probanda. Aliqui autem nituntur istam conclusionem rationibus probare. Sed simpliciter dico quod per rationem hoc non potest concludi, sed omnes rationes quae ad hoc fierent possent faciliter solvi. Ideo solum est tenendum auctoritate fidei, scilicet ex determinatione Ecclesiae Dei, nec aliter eam probo." Monica Brinzei, John T. Slotemaker, and I are now editing this section of d'Ailly's commentary, but see Petrus de Alliaco,

After giving some of the arguments in favor of the *Filioque*, especially those that purported to demonstrate that without the *Filioque* the Holy Spirit would not be distinct from the Son, d'Ailly remarks:

> Although this inference is true, the arguments of this doctor [Gregory of Rimini] do not prove it to be valid. This is clear, because they beg the question, as is clear to [anyone] paying attention. Indeed, they would be laughable to a Greek who would deny that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son. So I am astounded that such arguments come from such a subtle man.[12]

And d'Ailly falls back on faith. For d'Ailly, the further claim, against Greek criticism, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and Son as from one principle, not by two spirations, is also "to be held on the authority of faith alone and cannot be proven by reason."[13] Some of the arguments in support, again, beg the question, according to d'Ailly.

But on what authority is this faith determined? Pierre d'Ailly himself was clear that it was the Church *of Rome* that determined the faith:

> Although no evident argument can arise from the distinction of the Son and the Holy Spirit, or of generation and spiration, for proving that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Son, perhaps from this an apparent argument can be made for proving this against the Greeks . . . because otherwise one cannot see how the Greeks can explain the difference between generation and spiration . . . And perhaps this was the reason that motivated the Roman Church to determine and hold against the Greeks that the Holy Spirit proceeds from both, because it does not appear to me that this could be proven evidently otherwise from the text of Holy Scripture.[14]

Questiones super primum, tertium et quartum librum Sententiarum. Principia et questio circa prologum, ed. M. Brinzei (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013).

12 Petrus de Alliaco, *Quaestiones super libros Sententiarum*, I, q. 8, a. 1 (ed. Strasbourg, 1490), fol. 94ra: "Tertia est quod, licet ista consequentia valet, tamen rationes illius doctoris non probant ipsam esse bonam. Patet, quia petunt principium, ut patet intuenti. Immo essent derisoriae apud unum Graecum, qui negaret Spiritum Sanctum procedere a Filio. Ideo miror tales rationes fieri ab aliquo subtili viro."

13 Petrus de Alliaco, *Quaestiones super libros Sententiarum*, I, q. 8, a. 2 (ed. Strasbourg, 1490), fol. 94rb: "Dico tamen quod ista conclusio tenenda est sola fidei auctoritate et non posset convinci ratione."

14 Petrus de Alliaco, *Quaestiones super libros Sententiarum*, I, q. 8, a. 3 (ed. Strasbourg, 1490), fol. 97rb: "Quarto sequitur quod, licet ex distinctione Filii et Spiritus Sancti vel generationis

Intellectual historians can trace the Latin side—the side of the Roman Church—of the history of the *Filioque* controversy more or less along the lines of the entries in Denzinger's *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, following the collected statements of Greek and Latin Church Fathers, decisions of local synods in Spain, conciliar proclamations of the Carolingian era, and the final adoption of the term in the Creed in the Roman liturgy in the early eleventh century. For this reason, Anselm of Canterbury around 1100 could be certain that the *Filioque* represented the doctrine of the Universal Church and was compelled to defend the doctrine with elaborate philosophical arguments.[15] Yet it was not until the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, under Pope Innocent III, that the *Filioque* was determined officially by the Universal Church, a determination developed in 1274 at the Second Council of Lyon, as follows:[16]

Lateran IV, canon 1, 1215	**Lyon II, constitution II.1, 1274**
Firmiter credimus et simpliciter confitemur quod unus solus est verus Deus, aeternus, immensus, et incommutabilis, incomprehensibilis, omnipotens, et ineffabilis, Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus; tres quidem personae, sed una essentia, substantia, seu natura simplex omnino; Pater a nullo, Filius a solo Patre, ac Spiritus Sanctus pariter ab utroque, absque initio, semper, et sine fine; Pater generans, Filius nascens,	(A) Fideli ac devota professione fatemur quod Spiritus Sanctus aeternaliter ex Patre et Filio, non tanquam ex duobus principiis, sed tanquam ex uno principio, non duabus spirationibus, sed unica spiratione procedit. (B) Hoc professa est hactenus, praedicavit, et docuit, hoc firmiter tenet, praedicat, profitetur, et docet Sacrosancta Romana Ecclesia, mater

et spirationis non possit fieri evidens argumentum ad probandum quod Spiritus Sanctus procedat a Filio, tamen ex hoc potest fieri forte et apparens argumentum ad hoc probandum contra Graecos . . . quia non videtur aliter qualiter Graeci possint explicare differentiam generationis et spirationis . . . Et forte ista fuit ratio quae movit Ecclesiam Romanam ad determinandum et tenendum contra Graecos quod Spiritus Sanctus procedit ab utroque, quia non apparet mihi quod hoc posset aliter evidenter concludi ex textu sacrae scripturae."

15 Anselmus, *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, in *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi Opera Omnia*, ed. F. S. Schmitt (Edinburgh: T. Nelson et Filios, 1946), 2: 177–219.

16 I use the texts in the Barcelona: Herder, 1948, printing of Heinrich Denzinger's *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, nos. 428 (Lateran IV, canon 1) and 460 (Lyon II, constitution II.1).

(*cont.*)

Lateran IV, canon 1, 1215	Lyon II, constitution II.1, 1274
et Spiritus Sanctus procedens; consubstantiales et co-aequales, et co-omnipotentes et co-aeterni; unum universorum principium.	omnium fidelium et magistra. Hoc habet Orthodoxorum Patrum atque Doctorum, Latinorum pariter et Graecorum, incommutabilis et vera sententia. (C) Sed quia nonnulli propter irrefragabilis praemissae veritatis ignorantiam in errores varios sunt prolapsi, Nos, huiusmodi erroribus viam praecludere cupientes, Sacro approbante Concilio, damnamus et reprobamus qui negare praesumpserint aeternaliter Spiritum Sanctum ex Patre et Filio procedere, sive etiam temerario ausu asserere quod Spiritus Sanctus ex Patre et Filio tanquam ex duobus principiis, et non tanquam ex uno, procedat.

Since the *Filioque* was already accepted doctrine in 1215, a doctrine that did not originate with the pope, the papal/conciliar declaration at Lateran IV merely codified what was already agreed. Nor was it primarily directed at the Greeks; rather it was formulated against what was perceived as Joachim of Fiore's heretical attack on Peter Lombard's orthodox teaching.[17] The important points translate as follows:

> We firmly believe and simply confess that there is only one true God . . . Father and Son and Holy Spirit, three persons, indeed, but one completely simple essence, substance, or nature; the Father from none, the Son from the Father alone, and the Holy Spirit from each of the others

17 See Fiona Robb, "The Fourth Lateran Council's Definition of Trinitarian Orthodoxy," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 48 (1997): 22–43.

> equally, without beginning, always, and without end; the Father generating, the Son being born, and the Holy Spirit proceeding.

Lyon II, on the other hand, was geared to the Greeks:

> With a faithful and devout profession we acknowledge that the Holy Spirit proceeds eternally from the Father and the Son, not as from two principles, but as from one principle; not by two spirations, but by one single spiration. This the Holy Roman Church, mother and mistress of all the faithful, has professed, preached, and taught until now, this [the Roman Church] preaches, professes, and teaches. This is what the unchangeable and true belief of the orthodox fathers and doctors, both Latin and Greek, holds. But because some, on account of ignorance of the aforesaid indisputable truth, have fallen into various errors, We, wishing to block the path to such errors, with the approval of the Holy Council, condemn and reprove those who presume to deny that the Holy Spirit proceeds eternally from the Father and the Son, or who rashly assert that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son as from two principles and not as from one.

The *Filioque* itself, then, is officially declared at Lateran IV, but when it is reiterated at Lyon II, it is accompanied by additional clauses stressing that the Father and Son act as one principle, not two, with one spiration, not two. As far as I know, the history of this issue, and whether Lyon II had any real impact, has not been examined carefully. From what I have seen, just as Lateran IV did not modify Western teachings, the new statements at Lyon II did not change what was commonly accepted Latin doctrine. For example, Thomas Aquinas held the doctrine of one principle and one spiration throughout, although in his *Sentences* commentary from the 1250s he stated that the Father and Son could be considered two *spirantes* and two *spiratores*, whereas in the *Summa theologiae* from the late 1260s he changed his mind: they are two *spirantes* as an adjective, yes, but not two *spiratores* as a noun, but one *spirator*.[18] Eustache of Arras, the Franciscan master of theology at Paris who was involved in the lead-up to Lyon II as representative of King Louis IX of France, composed in 1268 or 1269 a lengthy question, "Whether [the Holy Spirit] proceeds from [the Father and Son] as they are more than one and distinct or as they are one." In this question, Eustache also argues that the Holy Spirit proceeds from

18 Thomas Aquinas, *Scriptum in primum librum Sententiarum*, d. 11, a. 4, resp., and *Summa theologiae*, prima pars, q. 36, a. 4, ad. 7.

the Father and Son insofar as they are one principle, although he defends the two *spirantes* and two *spiratores* position of the younger Aquinas.[19]

Given that the doctrine of one principle and one spiration was neither new nor papal, the clauses were probably aimed at new developments, most likely the negotiations with the Greeks. They were not aimed at a (previous) Greek "error," but at a (previous) Greek accusation against the Latin *Filioque*: that it entails two principles and two spirations. Indeed, a residue of this Byzantine accusation against the Latins survives in the tendancy of modern Byzantinists[20] and even of some scholars of the Latin West to refer to the "double" or "dual procession" of the *Filioque*, something that Lyon II tries explicitly to avoid, either because the Greek accusation needed refuting, or because the Greeks needed reassurance that what they were accepting at Lyon was orthodox doctrine.[21] As in the case of the *Filioque*, however, the doctrine itself of the single principle and single spiration was generally accepted in the West before its official proclamation. As is well known, it did not take long for the Greeks to reject the agreement at Lyon II,[22] but in the West the official declaration had been made.

It only remains to add that, perhaps confusingly, the pronouncements of Lateran IV and Lyon II were also associated with the popes who added them into what is now known as the *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, building on Gratian's *Decretum*. The canon from Lateran IV became the first of the *Decretales Gregorii IX*, a collection better known as the *Liber Extra*, which Gregory IX published in 1234. The constitution from Lyon II, in turn, was the first of Boniface's VIII's *Decretales Sexti* known as the *Liber Sextus*, from 1298.[23] To add further confusion, both decretals were entitled "De summa Trinitate et fide

19 Sophie Delmas and Chris Schabel, "Eustache d'Arras et le *Filioque*," *Archives d'Histoire Doctrinale et Littéraire du Moyen Age* 80 (2013): 247–75, at paras C3 (p. 263) and adB7 (p. 271).

20 The use of such terms is pervasive. See, for example, A. Edward Siencienski, *The Filioque: History of a Doctrinal Controversy* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), throughout.

21 I agree here with McEvoy, "Robert Grosseteste and the Reunion of the Church," 70–71.

22 Aristeides Papadakis, *Crisis in Byzantium. The Filioque Controversy in the Patriarchate of Gregory II of Cyprus (1283–1289)* (New York, NY: Fordham University Press, 1983; revised ed., Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1997); Tia M. Kolbaba, "History, Heresiology, Patristics and the Aftermath of the Second Council of Lyons (1274–1285)," in *Greeks, Latins, and Intellectual History 1204–1500*, ed. M. Hinterberger and Ch. Schabel (Leuven: Peeters, 2010), 43–68.

23 *Liber Extra*, l. I, tit. 1, cap. 1, and *Liber Sextus*, l. I, tit. 1, cap. un., in *Corpus Iuris Canonici*. 2, *Decretalium collectiones*, ed. E. Friedberg (Leipzig: Bernhardi Tauchnitz, 1879), coll. 5 and 937. For a succinct explanation, see Brian Tierney, *Foundations of the Conciliar Theory.*

catholica," and often scholastics assigned the Lyon decree to the *Liber Extra*. Thus in the 1310s the Franciscan John of Bassols felt the need to clarify: "This quotation is not from the beginning of the *Decretals*, but from the beginning of the *Liber Sextus*, taken from the Council of Lyon under Gregory the *fourth*"—an error for *tenth*.[24] In both cases in the canon law corpus, the pope and the council were announced, so that at least later theologians should have known their origins.

This preliminary discussion from the perspective of intellectual history seems to show that Innocent III and Gregory X, Lateran IV and Lyon II, did not create Western doctrine on the procession of the Holy Spirit, but only codified it. Western university theologians active between Lyon II and the Council of Florence were not intellectual historians, however. Since the procession of the Holy Spirit was both central to trinitarian theology and the main focus of doctrinal controversy with what were otherwise considered orthodox Greeks, almost all bachelors of theology in the universities dealt with the *Filioque* and commented on the Greek position in their lectures and commentaries on the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard, specifically distinction eleven of book one. Most treated the historical background in vague terms, if at all, yet to the extent that they ventured an historical explanation, a survey of the university treatments of several dozen Latin theologians active between 1274 and 1439 will reveal the historical importance in Western theology of the recent papal and conciliar decrees of Lateran IV and Lyon II.[25]

In what follows, I will confine myself to the internal discussion of Western university theologians. I will not deal with other genres that touch on these decrees, such as polemical works against the Greeks or commentaries on the decretals by canon lawyers, who did not have the doctrinal authority of the theologians. Before proceeding, I need to state that I am only partly prepared. This is because the Greeks and the *Filioque* are usually treated in one context in theological works, while the issue of the number of principles and spirations, one or two, is dealt with in another. Since my interest has been focused

The Contributions of the Medieval Canonists from Gratian to the Great Schism. Enlarged New Edition (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 12–16.

24 Iohannes de Bassolis, *In quatuor Sententiarum libros*, d. 12, q. 1 (Paris: François Regnault and Jean Frellon, 1517), fol. 105ra: "Contra: *Extra*, 'De summa Trinitate et fide catholica': 'Fideliter profitemur quod Spiritus Sanctus procedit a duobus ut sunt unum, non duo, non duabus spirationibus, sed una'—haec auctoritas non est in principio *Decretatium*, sed est in principio *Sexti libri* sumpta ex consilio Lugdunensi sub Gregorio quarto."

25 For the *Sentences* commentaries of the theologians I will be dealing with, see especially the survey chapters in *Mediaeval Commentaries on the* Sentences *of Peter Lombard*, ed. G. R. Evans (Leiden: Brill, 2002), vol. 1.

on what they say about the Greeks, I have collected or transcribed texts on the *Filioque* from about 80 university theologians active between Lyon II and Florence, where the declaration of Lyon II plays little explicit role. Thus far I have only been able to inspect about half that many treatments of the number of principles and spirations, where Lyon II is directly pertinent.[26]

Nevertheless, I have run across significant, if somewhat brief, discussions of the decree from Lyon II and, interestingly, two are by authors linked to the papal court in Avignon. The first treatment I found accidentally, in the *Quodlibet* of the Augustinian James of Pamiers, one of our few Parisian texts that refer to contemporary debates at the papal curia in Avignon, although not in our context. Not all university theologians managed to write a *Sentences* commentary that survived, so if one is interested in the *Filioque* discussion of an author like James of Pamiers, one has to search elsewhere in the hopes that he touched on the issue. In James's quodlibetal debate, conducted in Paris in 1332, someone asked, "Whether generating and spirating in the Father are really distinct."[27] Since this was the closest thing I could find to a place where he might have discussed the *Filioque*, I transcribed the question, which is unfortunately incomplete, being the last question in an incomplete *quodlibet*. The surviving manuscripts contain only the start of the first of four articles, "Whether spirating in the Father and Son is the same in number, or, if it is posited that it is not, whether it would be easy to save its identity with generating, with which it would not have as much in common."[28] What survives

---

26 Many of these texts will hopefully be included in the eventual Russell L. Friedman and Chris Schabel, *The* Filioque *in Parisian Theology from Scotus to the Black Death. With Texts and Studies on* Sentences *Commentaries, 1308–1348* (Leiden: Peeters), and they will be cited here as "ed. Friedman and Schabel, forthcoming."

27 Iacobus de Appamiis, *Quodlibet*, q. 14, MS Padova, Biblioteca Universitaria, 2006 (= P), fol. 155ra: "Utrum generare et spirare in Patre distinguantur realiter."

28 Iacobus de Appamiis, *Quodlibet*, q. 14, a. 1, P fol. 155rb: "Utrum idem spirare numero sit in Patre et Filio, aut, si poneret quod non, facile esset salvare identitatem cum generare cum quo non se haberet in plus." I can now add to Chris Schabel and William J. Courtenay, "Augustinian *Quodlibeta* after Giles of Rome," in *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages. The Fourteenth Century*, ed. Ch. Schabel (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 545–568, at 562 and 566, that MS Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek 529, is also incomplete, ending where the Bordeaux, Bibliothèque municipale, 167 and Padova, Universitaria 2006 witnesses do; the Avignon, Bibliothèque municipale, 314 and Roma, Biblioteca Angelica, 625 manuscripts and the Rimini 1626 and Cesena 1630 editions stop before this question; and the only other witness listed in Palémon Glorieux, *La littérature quodlibétique de 1260 à 1320* (Paris: J. Vrin, 1935), 2: 142, note 2, Padova, Biblioteca Antoniana, 426 Scaff. XX, which in the manuscript is assigned to the Franciscan James of Ascoli, is actually by either James du Quesnoy or Raymond Rigaud: see Sylvain Piron, "Franciscan *Quodlibeta* in Southern *Studia* and at

of James's question is his treatment of a position attributed in the margin to Master Thomas de Fabriano, whom we know to have been active as master of theology in James's Augustinian Order already by 1315, but from whom we have no surviving works, as far as I know.[29]

According to James, "a certain doctor of our order," meaning Thomas de Fabriano, "posited that spirating is not the same in number in the Father and in the Son, but rather two, and they are distinguished numerically,"[30] meaning, by analogy, that Father and Son drive the same car by model and year, say, a dark blue 1992 Honda Civic Ferio with unnecessary rear spoiler, but do not share the same car: they bought two of them. Thomas apparently gave three arguments in support of his position, to which James began his reply as follows:

> I do not hold this position, on account of the Church's explicit determination to the contrary, in *Extra*, "De summa Trinitate et fide catholica," in the *Liber Sextus*, where it says, "With a faithful and devout profession we acknowledge that the Holy Spirit proceeds eternally from the Father and the Son, [not as from two principles, but as from one principle], not by two spirations, but by one single spiration."[31]

This is from part A of the Lyon declaration above.

Apparently Thomas was ready for this objection, which does not mention Lyon II, but only the decretal that originated there, and James gives Thomas's reply:

Paris, 1280–1300," in *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages. The Thirteenth Century*, ed. Ch. Schabel (Leiden: Brill, 2006), 401–438 (423–427).

29 Damasus Trapp, "Augustinian Theology of the 14th Century. Notes on Editions, Marginalia, Opinions and Book–Lore," *Augustiniana* 6 (1956): 146–274 (174), cites evidence that Thomas de Fabriano was a bachelor in 1320, but William J. Courtenay, "Reflections on Vat. Lat. 1086 and Prosper of Reggio Emelia, O.E.S.A.," in *Theological Quodlibeta in the Middle Ages. The Fourteenth Century*, ed. Schabel, 345–57 (356), finds Thomas listed as a master by 1315.

30 Iacobus de Appamiis, *Quodlibet*, q. 14, a. 1, P fol. 155rb: "Quantum ad primum articulum, posuit quidam doctor nostri ordinis [Magister Thomas Fabriano *mg*.] quod non est idem spirare numero in Patre et in Filio, immo duo, et distinguuntur numeraliter."

31 Iacobus de Appamiis, *Quodlibet*, q. 14, a. 1, P fol. 155rb: "Istam opinionem non teneo, propter expressam determinationem Ecclesiae in contrarium, *Extra*, 'De summa Trinitate et fide catholica,' libro VI, ubi dicit sic: 'Fideli ac devota professione fatemur quod Spiritus Sanctus aeternaliter ex Patre et Filio, non tanquam ex duabus spiratoribus, sed unica spiratione sic procedit'."

> Although the Highest Pontiff pronounced these three points—namely, that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son; secondly, that He does not proceed as from two principles, but as from one; thirdly, that He proceeds not by two spirations, but by one single spiration—nevertheless, in the condemnation of opinions to the contrary he only condemns the first two points.[32]

James then quotes part C of the Lyon II canon given above, which, in fact, does not contain a condemnation of the third point.[33]

James's response to Thomas is more or less, "Come on, Thomas! It may not say that, but it's explicitly against the Church's confession, preaching, and teaching!" James then quotes the remaining part (part B) of the Lyon statement given above. Thus, although the condemnation is not explicit, it is implicit.[34] James then gives three arguments against Thomas's position, but there the text ceases.

Had James written a surviving question on the *Filioque*, I would not have bothered to transcribe this one. Indeed, from the point of view of attitudes toward the Greeks, the text is not very enlightening, because James never mentions them nor explains the origin of the version of the decretal "De summa Trinitate et fide catholica" that he quotes. It seems that most treatments of the numbers of the principles and spirations after 1274 similarly ignore the Greek issue, although a few theologians, such as the Franciscans Richard of

---

32 Iacobus de Appamiis, *Quodlibet*, q. 14, a. 1, P fol. 155rb–va: "Ad hoc respondetur sic: licet summus pontifex pronunciet haec tria puncta—scilicet quod Spiritus Sanctus procedat a Patre et Filio; secundo quod non procedit tanquam ex duobus [155va] principiis, sed tanquam ex uno; tertio quod procedit non duabus spirationibus, sed unica spiratione—tamen in condemnatione oppositarum opinionum solum condemnat prima duo puncta."

33 Iacobus de Appamiis, *Quodlibet*, q. 14, a. 1, P fol. 155va: "Unde subdit: 'Sed quia nonnulli . . . ex uno procedat.' Ex quibus evidenter patet quod solum prima duo puncta condemnat et non tertium. Quapropter probabiliter teneri potest via praemissa, quia non est contra determinationem Ecclesiae, ut videtur."

34 Iacobus de Appamiis, *Quodlibet*, q. 14, a. 1, P fol. 155va: "Sed illud non valet, quia licet dicatur quod non <est> contra determinationem Ecclesiae Spiritum Sanctum procedere duplici spiratione, tamen est expresse contra confessionem, praedicationem, et doctrinam Ecclesiae et contra veritatem determinatam a sanctis patribus Graecis atque Latinis. Haec omnia patent . . . subdit: 'Hoc professa . . . et vera sententia.' Ex his patet quod praedicta opinio non esset contra determinationem Ecclesiae, esset tamen <contra> eius confessionem et sanctorum patrum sententiam veram, nihilomus etiam potest dici praedictam opinionem positionem implicite esse (?) condemnatam in hoc quod dicit quod non duobus principiis, sed uno principio, quia si Pater et Filius spirarent Spiritum Sanctum duabus spirationibus, iam dicerentur duo principia et non unum principium."

Menneville (1280s), John Duns Scotus (ca. 1300), and John of Bassols (Reims, early 1310s), and the Carmelite Paul of Perugia (1340s), at least linked the decretal explicitly to Lyon and Pope Gregory. Menneville's and Scotus's commentaries were known to a great number of theologians. The fact that Scotus wrote that "in this question is it plain that the Father and the Son are one principle of the Holy Spirit: this was declared in the general council of Lyon under Gregory X, as it clear in *Extra*, 'De summa Trinitate et fide catholica', and it is today in the *Liber sextus* of decretals,"[35] must mean that many later scholastics were aware of the context, even if they wrote nothing about it. Bassols and Perugia both refer erroneously to Gregory IV, however, which suggests that the two are connected, with Perugia writing: "The minor is clear in *Extra*, 'De summa Trinitate et fide catholica,' in the Council of Lyon, under Gregory IV, where it is stated explicitly that 'the Father and the Son spirate the Holy Spirit as one perfect principle'."[36]

The only example I have found of a university theological text that deals with Lyon II and the Greeks explicitly is the secular theologian Richard FitzRalph's *Sentences* commentary from Oxford in the later 1320s. As I have written elsewhere, in his normal question on the *Filioque*, "Whether the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son," FitzRalph has to respond to an objection against the *Filioque* that, if the *Filioque* is correct, then all the Greeks are heretics.[37] The Irish secular theologian replies as follows:

---

35 Iohannes Duns Scotus, *Ordinatio in primum librum Sententiarum*, d. 12, q. 1, *Opera Omnia*, ed. C. Balić et al. (Vatican City: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1959), 5: 27.7–10: "In ista quaestione planum est quod Pater et Filius sunt unum principium Spiritus Sancti. Hoc declaratum est in concilio generali Lugdunensi sub Gregorio X, sicut patet *Extra*, 'De summa Trinitate et fide catholica,' et est hodie in VI libro *Decretalium*." Cf. Richardus de Mediavilla, *Super quatuor libros Sententiarum*, I, d. 11, q. 3 (Brescia: Vincenzo Sabbio, 1591), fol. 113rb: "Cui concordat Gregorius 10, *Extra*, 'De summa Trinitate et fide catholica,' dicens sic: 'Fideli ac devota . . .' "; For Bassols, see above, note 24.

36 Paulus Perusinus, *In quatuor libros Sententiarum*, ed. Friedman and Schabel, forthcoming, I, d. 11 (q. 21), dictum 3: "Secundo declaratur sic: omnis veritas quam Ecclesia Catholica affirmat est asserenda; sed Ecclesia affirmat istam veritatem; ergo. Maior est vera, ut ait Hieronymus: 'Haec est fides mea, ut quicquid Ecclesia determinat, hoc teneam pro fide.' Minor patet *Extra*, 'De summa Trinitate et fide catholica,' in Concilio Lugdunensi, sub Gregorio IV, ubi dicitur expresse quod 'Pater et Filius spirant Spiritum Sanctum in quantum unum perfectum principium'."

37 Chris Schabel, "Richard FitzRalph on the *Filioque* before and after His Conversations with Barlaam the Calabrian," in *Richard FitzRalph, His Life, Times, and Thought*, ed. M. Dunne and S. Nolan (Dublin: Four Courts Press, 2013), 128–55. The text is in Richardus Filii Radulphi, *In primum librum Sententiarum*, q. 4, ed. R. L. Friedman and Ch. Schabel,

> This is why the decretal in the *Liber Sextus*, "De summa Trinitate et fide catholica," the chapter "Fideli et devota," was done. As the gloss says there, the reason for the publication of this decretal was that at one time the Greeks held that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father alone, and at that time, as the gloss says, they were heretics. And this is Guido [de Baysio]'s gloss. But later, in the general council of Lyon, as Jean Lemoine's gloss states, all the Greeks agreed to this definition through their nuncios, and so now they are faithful.[38]

So while James of Pamiers presents an internal Western debate over the interpretation of *Extra*, "De summa Trinitate et fide catholica," Richard FitzRalph, reading canon lawyers, uses the Greek acceptance of the decretal to show that the Greeks believe in the *Filioque* now and thus are not heretics. That is, James ignores the Greeks and FitzRalph shows his ignorance of the Greeks. By the late 1340s, FitzRalph had had a rude awakening: in Avignon he learned that the Greeks had backslid and, doing a little homework, he came to understand slightly better the official history of the *Filioque*. In his *Summa de quaestionibus Armenorum*, written outside a university context, he states that the *Filioque* was defined under Pope Innocent III at Lateran IV ca. 1213, then, at Lyon II, the *Filioque* was again declared "on the authority of the successor of the Prince of the Apostles, Peter, namely Gregory X, in whom the authority resides with respect to defining things concerning the faith."[39] FitzRalph goes on as follows:

---

http://philosophy.nuim.ie/projects-research/projects/richard-fitzralph/text: "Utrum Spiritus Sanctus procedat a Patre et a Filio."

38 Richardus Filii Radulphi, *In primum librum Sententiarum*, q. 4, a. 3, ed. Friedman and Schabel [§78]: "Ad hoc enim facta est decretalis in VI libro, 'De summa Trinitate et fide catholica,' capitulo 'Fideli ac devota.' Causa autem editionis illius decretalis erat, sicut ibidem dicitur in glossa, quia Graeci aliquando tenuerunt quod Spiritus Sanctus procedat a solo Patre. Et tunc, sicut dicit glossa ibi, fuerunt haeretici. Et est glossa Guidonis. Postea tamen in consilio generali Lugdunensi, sicut dicit glossa Iohannis Monachi, omnes Graeci per suos nuntios in istam sententiam consenserunt, et ita nunc sunt fideles."

39 Richardus Filii Radulphi, *Summa de quaestionibus Armenorum*, ed. J. Sudoris (Paris: Jean Petit and Ponset le Preux, 1511), VI, c. 9, fol. 42vb: "Ante definitionem huius articuli per Latinos in Lateranensi Concilio sub Innocentio tertio circa annum Domini 1213, per multorum annorum curricula turba doctorum sanctorum miraculis choruscantium tam Latinorum quam Graecorum, videlicet Hylarus, Ambrosius, Ieronimus, Augustinus, Gregorius, Anselmus, etiam Athanasius Graecus, Didimus Graecus, Cyrillus Graecus, et Iohannes Crisostomus Graecus hunc articulum de processione Spiritus Sancti a Filio in suis litteris plenissime et planissime affirmaverunt, nullo doctorum maiorum Graecorum

> Consequently, at the [Second] Council of Lyons, with Patriarch Germanos [III] of the Greeks [actually former patriarch] and other prelates of theirs [actually only one more] present and agreeing, the definition of the same article was approved and it was defined with the assent of their Greek prelates that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son with a unique spiration as from one principle, not as from two principles.[40]

Up until a certain vague point before the definition at Lateran IV, according to FitzRalph, many Greeks supported and no major Greek doctor opposed the *Filioque*. If the Greeks are now, in the fourteenth century, being stubborn because they were not invited to Lateran IV, they should recall that not only were they invited to Lyon II, but they attended and accepted the decree. As a parting shot, FitzRalph mentions the clarification of Lyon II that the Holy Spirit proceeds by a single spiration as from one principle.

Although in the 1340s the Parisian Cistercian Jean de Mirecourt copied into his own *Sentences* commentary FitzRalph's earlier remarks,[41] FitzRalph was unusual to begin with in mentioning Lyon II in his *Sentences* commentary, and even more unusual after he was forced to learn more about the Greeks. Most theologians were not so explicit.

The alleged Greek complaint that they were not invited to Lateran IV is worth pursuing. Anselm had already explained that the consent of the Church of the Greeks was not obtained because it would have been very difficult to

---

aut Latinorum usque in illa tempora in aliqua terrarum suarum contrarium exprimente. Et ob hoc quod auctoritate successoris Principis Apostolorum Petri, videlicet Gregorii X, in quo ad definiendum ea quae fidem concernunt auctoritas residet."

40 Richardus Filii Radulphi, *Summa de quaestionibus Armenorum* ed. Sudoris, VI, c. 9, fol. 42vb: "Consequenter in Lugdunensi Concilio, praesentibus et consentientibus Germano patriarcha Graecorum et aliis praelatis eorum, definitio eiusdem articuli fuerat approbata, et quod Spiritus Sanctus unica spiratione tanquam ab uno principio, non tanquam a duobus principiis, procedit a Patre et Filio de eorum praelatorum Graecorum assensu fuerat definitum."

41 Iohannes de Mercurio, *In primum librum Sententiarum*, q. 24, ed. M. Parodi et al., available online at http://filosofia.dipafilo.unimi.it/~mparodi/mirecourt/testi/gestione/frame_quest.htm, paras 80–82: "Ad sextum, dicunt aliqui quod Ecclesia Graecorum non tenet hoc nunc, quia in consilio generali Lugdunensi per suos nuntios consenserunt integre nobiscum in illo articulo, ut dicit *Glossa Monachi*, super illud casum; quandoque tamen erraverunt et fuerunt haeretici, ut ibidem dicit *glossa*, et ideo Iohannes Damascenus, si sic credidit et pertinaciter sustinuit, fuit hereticus.—Sexta conclusio: Pater et Filius sunt unum principium spirans Spiritum Sanctum. Probatur *Extra*, 'De summa Trinitate et fide catholica,' capitulo 'Fideli,' in Sexto *Decretalium*, ubi dicitur sic . . ."

gather together their bishops to consult about the matter, nor was there need for any doubt.[42] Bonaventure elaborated on this in his *Sentences* commentary from the 1250s. The Franciscan relates that the Greeks call the Latins "schismatics" because the Latins started the division: they wanted to assert the *Filioque*, so they did not summon the Greeks. Bonaventure's response is interesting:

> It was not useful to call them, because the Church was able without them; it was laborious, because of the distance; it was fruitless, because there was not so much wisdom among the Greeks as there had been—indeed it had passed to the Latins; it was even dangerous, because there was the danger of calling into doubt what was to be taken as certain.[43]

A bit later, Thomas Aquinas wrote vaguely that the issue was in fact decided "at a certain council convoked in Western parts."[44] Just before Lyon II, Giles of Rome, the future teaching doctor of the Augustinian Order, was slightly more clear: "The Greeks were not summoned to the council in which this article was articulated, and so the angry [Greeks] did not want to accept it, although they believed what the Latins believed."[45] Both remarks were incorporated into later treatments, such as the *Quaestiones communes* of the University of Vienna in

---

42 Anselmus, *De processione Spiritus Sancti*, ed. Schmitt, c. 13, 212.1–4.

43 Bonaventura, *In quatuor libros Sententiarum*, I, d. 11, a. un., q. 1, *Opera Omnia* (Quaracchi: Collegio San Bonaventura, 1882), 1: 212a–b: "Sed quia mos est haereticorum et schismaticorum, cum se non possunt rationibus communire, adversam partem accusare, ideo nos accusant et redarguunt tanquam curiosos et tanquam excommunicatos et schismaticos . . . Similiter dicunt nos schismaticos, quia a nobis incepit divisio. Cum enim hoc vellemus asserere, noluimus eos vocare. Et ad hoc responderi potest pro Latinis quod eos vocare non fuit opportunum, quia Ecclesia sine eis hoc poterat; et [hoc] quia erat laboriosum propter distantiam; erat infructuosum, quia iam non erat in Graecis sapientia tanta sicut fuerat, immo ad Latinos transierat; erat nihilominus periculosum, quia quod pro certo habendum erat periculum erat ducere in dubium."

44 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, pars prima, q. 36, a. 2, ad. 2: "Postea, insurgente errore quorundam, in quodam *Concilio* in Occidentalibus partibus congregato, expressum fuit auctoritate Romani pontificis." Followed by Dominicans like Iohannes Quidort, *Commentaire sur les Sentences* I, d. 11, q. 3 (q. 54), ed. J.-P. Müller (Rome: Herder, 1961), 1: 163.17–19: "Licet autem istae excusationes valerent ante concilium in quo fuit definitum quod Spiritus Sanctus procedit a Patre et Filio, tamen post illud concilium non habent istae excusationes locum . . ."

45 Aegidius Romanus, *In primum librum Sententiarum*, d. 11, q. 1 (Venice, 1521; reprint Frankfurt: Minerva, 1968), fols. 64rb–va: "Vel dicendum quod, ut dicitur, ad concilium in quo fuit expressus iste articulus Graeci vocati non fuerunt, et ideo indignati noluerunt ipsum recipere, licet cre[64va]derent quod Latini credebant."

the decades before the Council of Florence.[46] In the 1310s the Franciscan Hugh de Novocastro specified that this council was "nearby" (*vicinum*), a clarification that we also find in some later authors.[47] In the same decade, Peter Auriol rephrased Anselm's remark as refering to a "council": there was no need to gather a council where Greeks and Latins could come together, and it would have been difficult to collect the Greeks to discuss this matter.[48]

Since by Anselm's time the lines had been drawn quite clearly and, as mentioned above, Lateran IV merely made more official what was already Latin orthodoxy, the anonymous author of *Contra Graecos*, composed in Constantinople in 1252, could more reasonably assert that the Greeks were not invited to the "concilium ultramontanum quando illa dictio 'Filioque procedit' " was added.[49] Given FitzRalph's presentation, however, when university theologians simply mentioned a vague "nearby council," one wonders if they meant Lateran IV or some earlier council, such as the *ultramontanum* Council of Frankfurt of 794. Whether this was imprecision, ignorance, or indifference on the part of these scholastics, or a combination of these, probably the majority of theologians ventured no historical account at all of what was sometimes called "the controversy between Greeks and Latins." Of those who did, there was an alternative explanation, as Peter Auriol related around 1316:

> But one must consider that, although some people attribute the cause of the Greeks' schism to their arrogance and contempt, on account of

46 See the composite edition in Chris Schabel, "Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl and the *Filioque* at Vienna *on the Eve of the Council of Florence*," in *Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl and the* Sentences *at Vienna in the Early Fifteenth Century*, ed. M. Brinzei (Turnhout: Brepols, 2015), paras 16 and 21.

47 Hugo de Novocastro, *In quatuor libros Sententiarum*, I, d. 11, q. 1, a. 2, ed. Friedman and Schabel, forthcoming: "Secundo videndum est de positione Graecorum circa hoc, et pono causam scismatis eorum. Causa huius fuit quoddam concilium vicinum ubi Graeci non fuerunt vocati et ubi determinatum fuit quod Spiritus Sanctus procedit a Patre et Filio." Cf. Paulus Perusinus, *In quatuor libros Sententiarum*, I, d. 11 (q. 22), dictum 1, ed. Friedman and Schabel: "Nam hoc tenendum est sicut articulus fidei ex eo quod tenet Ecclesia Catholica ex determinatione in concilio vicino."

48 Petrus Aureoli, *Scriptum in primum librum Sententiarum*, d. 11, ed. Russell L. Friedman, Lauge O. Nielsen, and Chris Schabel, available online at http://www.peterauriol.net/auriol-pdf/SCR-11.pdf, d. 11, p. 18, lines 929–934: "Ad secundum dicendum sicut Anselmus respondet . . . Nec fuit necessarium congregari concilium ubi Graeci et Latini convenire deberent. Nimis difficile fuisset congregare episcopos Graecos ad consulendum de hac re, nec oportebat."

49 *Contra Graecos*, in PL 140, col. 540a.

> the fact that they were not called to the council where this was declared, as they say, it seems rather that the cause was the change of the empire, for the Greeks kept an emperor and did not want to obey the man whom the Roman Church established from among the Germans. Because of this they were separated from obedience to the Church and fell into various errors.[50]

This is a version of something Auriol had stated earlier in his text, specifically mentioning Charlemagne.[51] The importance of this *translatio imperii* was already made popular in the work of Otto of Freising from the early twelfth century.[52] Various people adopted Auriol's approach in the decades that followed, the Franciscan Landolfo Caracciolo, and the Augustinian Alphonsus Vargas at Paris, the Cistercian Conrad of Ebrach at Bologna, and the Franciscan John of Rodington at Oxford being examples.[53]

---

50 Petrus Aureoli, *Scriptum in primum librum Sententiarum*, d. 11, a. 1, ed. Friedman, Nielsen, and Schabel, 5, lines 231–237. "Est autem considerandum quod licet causa scismatis Graecorum assignetur ab aliquibus superbia et contemptus, pro eo quod non fuerunt vocati ad concilium ubi hoc extitit declaratum, ut dicunt, magis tamen videtur quod causa fuerit mutatio imperii, nam Graeci retinuerunt sibi imperatorem, nec voluerunt obedire ei quem Romana ecclesia instituit de Germanis. Propter quod divisi sunt ab obedientia Ecclesiae, et in diversos errores collapsi sunt, imponentes Latinis errorem de conficiendo in azimo, et de processione Spiritus Sancti, ut occasionem sibi sumerent et velamen inobedentiae suae."

51 Petrus Aureoli, *Scriptum in primum librum Sententiarum*, d. 11, a. 1, ed. Friedman, Nielsen, and Schabel, 4, lines 192–196: "Unde patet quod tempore unitatis Ecclesiae Latinae cum Graeca, et quamdiu Imperatores fuerunt in Constantinopolim, nullus Graecus negavit pertinaciter Spiritum Sanctum procedere a Filio, sed incepit ista rebellio post omnes doctores, cum translatum fuit Graecorum imperium in Germanos sub magnifico Carolo; ex tunc enim indignati sunt Graeci et in varias haereses sunt prolapsi."

52 See, e.g., J.G.A. Pocock, *Barbarism and Religion*, vol. 3: *The First Decline and Fall* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 98–126. In the early 1420s, Thomas Ebendorfer of Hasselbach added a reference to Otto of Freising in his version of the Viennese *Quaestiones communes*: Schabel, "Nicholas of Dinkelsbühl and the *Filioque* at Vienna," para. 27.

53 Landulphus Caraccioli, *In quatuor libros Sententiarum*, I, d. 11, q. 2, ed. Friedman and Schabel, forthcoming: "Et ex hoc sequitur unum corrolarium, scilicet quod, licet de tempore quo translatum est imperium de Graecis ad Romanos et Germanos, imperator ille Graecorum ut populus obediret ecclesiae invenit istud schisma . . ."; Alphonsus Vargas Toletanus, *In primum librum Sententiarum*, dd. 11–12, aa. 3–4 (Venice: Paganinus de Paganinis, 1490; reprint New York, NY: The Meriden Gravure, 1952), fol. 102vb: "Et si quaeratur cur Graeci nunc in tantam haeresim sunt prolapsi, nec doctores suos sequuntur, dicitur communiter quod tempore quo translatum est imperium de Graecis ad

More frequently, theologians simply cited the place in canon law where the statements of Lateran IV and Lyon II were included, *Extra*, "De summa Trinitate et fide catholica." As mentioned above, the Lateran IV version was in the *Decretales* of Gregory IX, although this is not usually specified by the theologians, whereas the Lyon II version was in the *Liber Sextus* of Boniface VIII, and theologians such as the Franciscan William of Nottingham and the Benedictine Robert Graystanes in early fourteenth-century Oxford and the Carmelite Michael de Aiguani from late fourteenth-century Paris did specify Boniface's name, further distancing the decretal from Lyon II and Gregory X.[54] At least they connected the decree to popes. Other rough contemporaries linked this version to "a council," like the Franciscans Peter Auriol and John of

Germanos, tempore Caroli Magni, Graeci indignati inobedientes facti sunt et ecclesiae et imperatori et, ut viderentur recedere rationabiliter ab obedientia Ecclesiae Romanae, imposuerunt Latinis haeresim, dicentes esse haereticum quod Spiritus Sanctus procedat a Filio, et ita accipientes non causam ut causam seu pro causa in hunc errorem prolapsi sunt"; Conradus de Ebrach, *In quatuor libros Sententiarum*, I, dd. 9–12, a. 3, ed. Ch. Schabel, forthcoming, copies Alphonsus Vargas verbatim; Iohannes de Rodington, *In primum librum Sententiarum*, d. 11, ed. Ch. Schabel and R. L. Friedman, "Trinitarian Theology and Philosophical Issues III: Oxford 1312–1329: Walsingham, Graystanes, Fitzralph, and Rodington", *Cahiers de l'Institute du Moyen-Âge grec et latin* 74 (2003): 39–88 (82), para. 11a: "Quando imperium fuit translatum de Graecia ad Romanos, statuit ille imperator Graecus alias sectas in Ecclesia Graecorum contrarias sectis Ecclesiae occidentalis ne si Ecclesia obediret Ecclesiae, imperio obediret imperium." The Dominican Bernardus Lombardi, *In quatuor libros Sententiarum*, d. 11, a. 2, ed. Friedman and Schabel, forthcoming, does not seem to have read Auriol carefully: "Graeci etiam fuerunt istius opinionis, sed ex superbia ab eorum antiquis doctoribus resilierunt, quia in concilio non fuerunt vocati, et similiter quia nos in azimis conficimus. Vide Aureolum."

54 Guillelmus de Nottingham, *In primum librum Sententiarum*, d. 11, q. 1, ed. R. L. Friedman, "Trinitarian Theology and Philosophical Issues I," *Cahiers de l'Institute du moyen-âge grec et latin* 72 (2001): 89–168, at p. 127, lines 37–39: "Scribitur autem *Extra*, 'De summa Trinitate et fide catholica,' et est Bonifatius VIII in VI libro decretalis: 'Fideli ac devota professione fatemur . . .' "; Robertus Graystanes, *In primum librum Sententiarum*, d. 11 (q. 23), a. 1, ed. Ch. Schabel and R. L. Friedman, "Trinitarian Theology and Philosophical Issues III," 54, lines 45–47: "Sed quicquid sit de hoc, ex hoc Ecclesia determinavit hoc esse tenendum ut de substantia fidei, ut patet *Extra*, 'De summa Trinitate et fide catholica,' per dominum etiam Bonifatium, capitulo primo: 'Firmiter est tenendum quod Spiritus Sanctus procedit ab utroque' "; Michael de Aiguani, *In quatuor libros Sententiarum*, I, d. 12, q. un. (Venice: Leonardo Vega, 1510), fol. 33rb: "Ad oppositum est determinatio Sacrosanctae Romanae Ecclesiae, libro VI, 'De summa Trinitate et fide catholica,' capitulo 'Fideli,' ubi dicit Bonifatius: 'Fideli . . .' "

Ripa and the Augustinians Gregory of Rimini and Hugolino of Orvieto at Paris, but they did not name the council.[55]

Many if not most theologians, however, mentioned neither pope nor council nor decretal, the most popular argument from authority being a simple reference to the creed, which they heard and recited on a regular basis. Thomas Aquinas, for example, was content with this *auctoritas* in his opening arguments *Sed contra*.[56] Only the most ignorant writers could claim that this creed was from the first councils held in the East, like the author of the anonymous *Treatise on the Greeks' Objections against the Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Son* (*Tractatus de obiectionibus Graecorum contra processionem Spiritus Sancti a Filio*), which its editor, Friedrich Stegmüller, attributed to a Dominican residing in Constantinople and Pera in the early fourteenth century, William Bernard of Gaillac.[57] William was no Parisian theologian, although he did serve as lector in Toulouse at one point.

If the explicit mention of papal and conciliar authority was often absent or merely perfunctory, Pierre d'Ailly's example shows that for some theologians in the latter half of the fourteenth century authority was all there was. The Cistercian Pierre Ceffons, lecturing on the *Sentences* at Paris during the Black Death, will illustrate this. Ceffons tacked on a doubt to the end of his question on the procession of the Holy Spirit: "Are the Father and Son as [one] principle

55 Petrus Aureoli, *Scriptum in primum librum Sententiarum*, d. 12, ed. Friedman, Nielsen, and Schabel, available online at http://www.peterauriol.net/auriol-pdf/SCR-12.pdf, 2, lines 101–102: "Sed Concilium dicit, *Extra*, 'De summa trinitate et fide catholica,' capitulo 'Fideli,' libro VI, quod 'fideli ac devota professione fatemur . . .' "; ibidem, a. 3, p. 9, lines 438–439: "Sed sunt unum principium, ut determinat concilium generale *Extra*, 'De summa Trinitate et fide catholica,' capitulo fidei, libro 6"; Ernst Borchert, *Die Trinitätslehre des Johannes de Ripa* (Munich: F. Schöningh, 1974), 720: ". . . sic sunt duo principia respectu Spiritus Sancti, consequens contra determinationem concilii Extra, 'De summa Trinitate et fide catholica' in Sexto"; Gregorius Ariminensis, *Lectura super primum et secundum Sententiarum*, I, d. 12, q. un., ed. D. Trapp, V. Marcolino, and M. Santos-Noya (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1982), 2: 195, lines 3–8: "Hanc etiam propositionem non esse in sua proprietate et de virtute sermonis intelligendam satis innuunt verba concilii *Extra*, 'De summa Trinitate et fide catholica,' libro 6, ubi sic dicitur: 'Fatemur . . .' Ubi patet quod, quia quasi concilium noluit affirmare . . ."; Hugolinus de Urbe Veteri, *Commentarius in quattuor libros Sententiarum*, dd. 10–13, q. un., dubium 4, ed. W. Eckermann (Würzburg: Cassiciacum, 1984), 2: 223, lines 53–57: "Hoc satis innuunt verba concilii *Extra*, 'De summa Trinitate et fide catholica,' libro 6: 'Fatemur . . .'. Ubi nota tria. Primum, quia concilium noluit affirmare . . ."

56 Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologiae*, pars prima, q. 36, a. 2.

57 In *Analecta Upsaliensia theologiam medii Aevi illustrantia*, vol. 1: *Opera systematica*, ed. F. Stegmüller (Uppsala: Lundequistska, 1952), 323–360 (356).

spirating the Holy Spirit?" Ceffons remarks that the Church determined this in *Extra*, "De summa Trinitate et fide catholica," in the *Liber Sextus*, where "the council" proclaimed that they are not two principles, but one, and it is not by two spirations, but one.[58] Summarizing rather bluntly what Gregory of Rimini had said a few years earlier,[59] Ceffons argued as follows:

> Regarding this doubt, without asserting anything rashly, because it is dangerous to state anything by assertion, I say that, for me, I do not know how to uphold that proposition taken properly, namely this one: "The Father and the Son are one principle spirating the Holy Spirit."[60]

Then, reminiscent of the Augustinian James of Pamiers's opponent, Thomas de Fabriano, Ceffons concludes the doubt and the entire question as follows:

> To the argument to the opposite, whoever would be of this opinion [against the proposition], concerning which I determine nothing, [would say] that the council does not state that the Father and the Son *are* one principle spirating, but it states that [the Holy Spirit] "proceeds" from them "*as* from one principle." Thus he would say that they are *not* one principle, but that they spirate uniformly and one does so equally perfectly as the other, and thus in harmony *as if* they were one principle spirating.[61]

58 Petrus de Ceffons, *In quatuor libros Sententiarum*, I, d. 10, MS Troyes, Médiathèque du Grand-Troyes, 62 (= T), fol. 55rb: "Aliud dubium: pro eo quod dicitur quod Pater et Filius simul spirant et aeque perfecte, dubitatur utrum Pater et Filius sicut principium spirans Spiritum Sanctum si<n>tunum. Auctoritate Ecclesiae hoc determinat *Extra*, 'De summa Trinitate et fide catholica,' et libro 6, capitulo 'Fideli,' ubi dicit Concilium: 'Fatemur . . .' "

59 Gregorius Ariminensis, *Lectura super primum et secundum Sententiarum*, I, d. 12, q. un., ed. Trapp, Marcolino, and Santos-Noya, 193, line 17 and 196, line 30.

60 Petrus de Ceffons, *In quatuor libros Sententiarum*, I, d. 10, T fol. 55rb: "Ad hoc dubium nihil temere asserendo, quia periculosum est hic dicere aliquid assertione, dico quod pro me nescio sustinere illam propositionem in sua proprietate sumptam, scilicet hanc: 'Pater et Filius sunt unum principium spirans' ".

61 Petrus de Ceffons, *In quatuor libros Sententiarum*, I, d. 10, T fol. 55rb: "Ad argumentum in oppositum, qui esset illius opinionis, circa quam nihil hic determino, <diceret> quod concilium non dicit quod Pater et Filius sint unum principium spirans, sed dicit quod ab ipsis 'tanquam ex uno principio procedit.' Unde diceret quod non sunt unum principium, sed uniformiter spirant et aeque perfecte unus sicut alter, et ita concorditer acsi esset unum principium spirans."

What does this all mean for this volume? Western theologians could write up to 100 pages of largely philosophical discussion on the procession of the Holy Spirit without even mentioning popes, Western councils, or the decretals, and at most these issues were given a paragraph or two.[62] Usually His Holiness merely stamped accepted teaching as official, although this official stamp could be useful, especially when arguing against the Greeks, whose authorities were rejected on the grounds that they did not have papal approval. The pope could try to move doctrine slightly in one way or another, as Clement V did at the Council of Vienne in 1311–1312, but even then theologians found ways to interpret the decision against its intent, as perhaps Pierre Ceffons suggested.[63] Most often the pope sought the advice of the professional theologians, as did John XXII on various occasions.[64] And when Pope John made statements against the common doctrine of the Beatific Vision, the theologians corrected him. Following John XXII's lead, Benedict XII, a.k.a. the Cistercian Jacques

62 Indeed, the recent, mammoth monograph by Friedman, *Intellectual Traditions at the Medieval University*, at over 1000 pages the largest survey of medieval positions, only mentions the Second Council of Lyon on pp. 10 and 519, and while the Fourth Lateran Council is discussed more often, only once (p. 10) is in connection with the *Filioque*.

63 See, for example, William Duba, "The Souls After Vienne: Franciscan Theologians' Views on the Plurality of Forms and the Plurality of Souls, ca. 1315–1330," in *Philosophical Psychology and the Other Disciplines*, ed. P.J.J.M. Bakker, S.W. de Boer and C. Leijenhorst (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 171–272; William Duba, "Destroying the Text: Contemporary Interpretations of John XXII's 'Constitutiones,' " in *Papst Johannes XXII. Konzepte und Verfahren seines Pontifikats*, ed. H.-J. Schmidt and M. Rohde (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2014), 37–70.

64 On these issues, see Richard Scholz, *Unbekannte kirchenpolitische Streischriften aus der Zeit Ludwigs des Bayern (1327–1354). Analysen und Texte*, 2 vols. (Rome: Loescher, 1911–1914); Joseph Koch, "Der Prozeß gegen den Magister Johannes de Polliaco und seine Vorgeschichte (1312–1321)," *Recherches de théologie ancienne et médiévale* 5 (1948): 391–422; Louis Duval-Arnoud, "Les Conseils remis à Jean XXII sur le problème de la pauvreté du Christ et des apôtres (MS. BAV Vat. lat. 3740)," *Miscellanea Bibliothecae Apostolicae Vaticanae* (Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 1989), 3: 121–201; Jürgen Miethke, *De potestate papae: Die päpstliche Amtskompetenz im Widerstreit der politischen Theorie von Thomas von Aquin bis Wilhelm von Ockham* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000); Sylvain Piron, "Censures et condamnation de Pierre de Jean Olivi: enquête dans les marges du Vatican," *Mélanges de l'École française de Rome. Moyen Age* 118.2 (2006): 313–373; Alain Boureau, *Le pape et les sorciers. Une consultation de Jean XXII sur la magie en 1320 (manuscrit B.A.V. Borghese 348)* (Rome: École française de Rome, 2004); Patrick J. Nold, *Marriage Advice for a Pope. John XXII and the Power to Dissolve* (Leiden: Brill, 2009); and the survey in Sylvain Piron, "Avignon sous Jean XXII, l'Eldorado des théologiens," in *Jean XXII et le Midi* (Toulouse: Privat, 2012), 357–392.

Fournier, master of theology at the University of Paris, made the definitive statement *Benedictus Deus* in 1336, with the advice of a panel of other theologians.[65]

It is highly unlikely that the intellectual debates and cross-cultural interactions involving the papacy and the East had—or have today—any chance of succeeding in the long run. The pope would not have been able to compromise on the *Filioque* as long as the doctrine was on the negotiating table, and the main elements of the doomed definition of Florence merely repeated what was said at Lyon in 1274.[66] The most effective policy may have been to avoid intellectual discussions of doctrinal matters altogether and to concentrate on obtaining a token acceptance of papal primacy, as happened in places like Calabria and Cyprus. Better knowledge of the East, the increased flow of people, texts, and ideas, and more doctrinal debates may only have served to inform the pope of how difficult union on his terms would be to achieve. It was like solving the Cyprus problem: the closer you look, the worse it gets.

65 The biggest treatment of the subject is Christian Trottmann, *La vision béatifique des disputes scolastiques à sa définition par Benoît XII* (Paris: École française de Rome, 1995).

66 Georg Hofmann, *Concilium Florentinum: Documenta et scriptores*, series A, Bd. 1: *Epistolae pontificiae ad Concilium Florentinum spectantes* (Rome: Pontificium Institutum Orientalium Studiorum, 1944), vol. 2, no. 176: "Spiritus Sanctus ex Patre et Filio aeternaliter est, et essentiam suam suumque esse subsistens habet ex Patre simul et Filio, et ex utroque aeternaliter tamquam ab uno principio et unica spiratione procedit." Cf. Lyon II above: "Spiritus Sanctus aeternaliter ex Patre et Filio, non tanquam ex duobus principiis, sed tanquam ex uno principio, non duabus spirationibus, sed unica spiratione procedit."